

The following items from the CPWG were discussed.

1. Refresh item (012) – request to be able to ask for aggregate data on an account level 867 instead of interval data even though interval data is available

Discussion: ComEd and Ameren do not want to build functionality, and would rather pass the level of detail that they currently have. No one saw a need for this functionality, especially if other summary data on the 867 is agreed to by the utilities.

Result: Functionality will not be built, and will not be added to the standards. Will be closed by CPWG.

2. Refresh item (013) – both ComEd and Ameren have issues with 820's that have null or negative payment amounts

Discussion: Further investigation needed to see if null issue is from the RES, the bank, or utility translators. Further discussion needed on negative amounts. Utilities do not want them on inbound 820's, since it causes balancing problems with accounts. RES's will need them on outbound 820's for POR payments when bills are cancelled. New standard, or coding for the new standard may help fix the null problem on the utility side.

Result: Further investigation and discussion needed.

3. Refresh item (019) - Move sync-up lists to the standards group from CPWG – EDI not the best delivery mechanism for this.

Discussion: Agreement that EDI is not the best mechanism

Result: Moved from CPWG to standards group. A separate meeting will be setup to discuss data fields, format, and delivery mechanisms. Will be closed as an item for CPWG.

4. Refresh item (020) – standards group input needed for whether usage or billed usage that has been adjusted should be included on the 867.

Discussion: For 99% of customers this is not an issue. Only an issue with usage adjusted by rates/riders or complex metering situations (generator, in with outflow, etc). One RES stated they would want the non-adjusted usage for scheduling purposes. There was some discussion that this may not be as big of an issue if the utilities start sending meter types and load types.

Result: More discussion needed. Held until CPWG gets to the 867 transaction. Participants and utilities to do more research.

5. Refresh item (021) – need standards group input on sending pending final notices to RESs

Discussion: EDI has fields that are used in other markets for notifications and for changes to dates. There is also the cancellation of a drop that could be used. Some RESs thought this was more important for larger customers than mass market customers. ComEd and Ameren currently only send a drop after the final bill. ComEd has a manual report that shows pending drops. ComEd stated their move rate is 20% per year, so this could potentially be a large number of transactions.

Result: More discussion is needed on how this should work in Illinois.

6. 810 issue (022) – should utilities accept RES account numbers, and mimic them back on all EDI transactions?

Discussion: RESs would like this feature. Can be optional – only used if RES sends the account number to the utility.

Result: Will be added to the standard as an optional field. Will be closed by CPWG.

7. 810 issue (023) – should the bill cycle be passed on the 810?

Discussion: No one saw a need for this since the RESs should already have this info. Makes no sense on an 810 bill ready transaction.

Result: Bill cycle will not be part of the standard for the 810. Will be closed by CPWG.

8. 810 issue (024) – Ameren needs to lay out their plan for using the service point field. This impacts all EDI transactions, not just the 810.

Discussion: Ameren needs to schedule time to present this to the standards and/or billing group.

Result: Meeting to be scheduled.

9. 810 issue (025) – Ameren needs to define how flat rate amounts and adjustments will be handled for rate ready. Impacts the fields used on the 810.

Discussion: Ameren needs to schedule time to present this to the standards and/or billing group.

Result: Meeting to be scheduled.